

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:	Date: August 2, 2007
Kevin D. BAIR	Confirmation No.: 2095
Serial No.: 09/733,429	Group Art Unit: 2163
Filed: December 8, 2000	Examiner: Hanh B. Thai
For:	METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ACCESSING INFORMATION ON A NETWORK

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY TO ACTION OF MAY 1, 2007**

Claims 49, 51-60, 62-71, and 73-81 are currently pending in the application.  
Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**I. The § 103 Rejections**

Claims 49-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,463 (“Draaijer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,827 (“Raz”)

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 49 recites a second computer system processing a query including performing an operation on data and metadata to generate a result for the query, in which the data and the metadata were not stored on the second computer system prior to the second computer system receiving the request to process the query.

*A. Draaijer Fails To Disclose Processing, at a Second Computer System, a Query Including Performing an Operation on Data and Metadata to Generate*

*a Result for the Query, in which the Data and the Metadata Were Not Stored on the Second Computer System Prior to the Second Computer System Receiving the Request to Process the Query*

Draaijer discloses a local database server that includes a heterogeneous services module to selectively send requests to foreign processes based on the capabilities of the foreign processes (see Abstract). The Examiner recognizes that Draaijer fails to disclose a second computer system processing a query including performing an operation on data and metadata to generate a result for the query, in which the data and the metadata were not stored on the second computer system prior to the second computer system receiving the request to process the query. The Examiner, however, asserts that this limitation, absent from Draaijer and recited in claim 49, is disclosed by Raz.

*B. Raz Fails To Disclose Processing, at a Second Computer System, a Query Including Performing an Operation on Data and Metadata to Generate a Result for the Query, in which the Data and the Metadata Were Not Stored on the Second Computer System Prior to the Second Computer System Receiving the Request to Process the Query*

Raz discloses an information transfer network that includes a plurality of client terminals and a plurality of servers. The plurality of servers includes a database system. The information transfer network further includes a request broker system that permits the exchange of information between the client terminals and the plurality of servers (see Abstract).

In rejecting claim 49, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 31-40 of Raz. In the cited portion, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Raz discloses that when an application

requires information that is not on the information database servers, but that information can be reached at some other content provider system, the information database servers establish a connection to the content provider to get the required information. Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that such a teaching does not read on the limitations of claim 49 for several reasons.

First, assuming that the information database servers of Raz operate in a similar manner to Applicant's invention (which Applicant does not concede), Raz fails to disclose that the metadata required for the information database servers to get the information from the content provider is not stored with the information database server. Raz's information transfer network includes databases that comprise a generic database model as shown in FIG. 8, and such a database model includes metadata that represents the structure of data that is processed by the database. Thus, because Raz's information database servers comprise a generic database model, each of the information database servers of Raz clearly includes metadata to process a given query.

Second, in the cited portion, Raz fails to disclose that the information database servers processes a query including performing an operation on data and metadata to ***generate a result for the query***. Raz discloses only that the information database servers get the information from content provider, and Applicant respectfully submits that in such a case, a database associated with the content provider generates the result for the query and sends the result to the information database servers.

*C. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference*

Both Draaijer and Raz fail to disclose a second computer system processing a query including performing an operation on data and metadata to generate a result for the

query, in which the data and the metadata were not stored on the second computer system prior to the second computer system receiving the request to process the query.

Consequently, the combination of Draaijer and Raz cannot render claim 49 obvious.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 49, and the claims that depend therefrom, should be allowable over Draaijer and Raz.

*D. Other Independent Claims*

Claims 60 and 71 each incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 49. Claims 60 and 71, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also allowable over Draaijer and Raz for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 49.

Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

August 2, 2007  
Date

/Kelvin M. Vivian/  
Kelvin M. Vivian  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 53,727  
(650) 475-1448